A LETTER

TO

THE VERY REVEREND

THE DEAN OF CHICHESTER,

ON THE

AGITATION EXCITED BY THE APPOINTMENT OF

DR HAMPDEN

TO THE SEE OF HEREFORD.

BY

JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A.

ARCHDEACON OF LEWES.

LONDON:

JOHN WILLIAM PARKER, WEST STRAND:

SOLD BY MACMILLAN, CAMBRIDGE.

1848.

London:
Printed by S. & J. Bentley, Wilson, and Fley,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

TO THE DEAN OF CHICHESTER.

My dear Dean,

You wrote to me a fortnight ago, to inform me of certain measures which the Chapter of Chichester were about to take with the view of endeavouring to avert the appointment of Dr Hampden to the See of Hereford; and you seemed to wish that I should propose some similar measure to the Clergy in the Archdeaconry of Lewes. When we met two days after in the Convocation, you spoke to me on the same subject. My answer was, that, having never read any of Dr Hampden's writings, I should feel it my duty beforehand to examine them, especially his Bampton Lectures, which are the main ground of the charges brought against him, in order to make out whether they do indeed contain sufficient reason for doing, what, at all events, must imply a grave condemnation of a person who had for eleven years filled the first theological chair in one of our Universities. Since then I have returned a like answer to similar applications, which have been addrest to me by clergymen in this Archdeaconry. To my surprise, my answer has seemed in some cases to surprise the applicants. Yet what other answer could a person return, who had any sense of the solemn responsibility incurred by such a proceeding, and knew that he

was called to do justly, and to love mercy, in all the relations of life, whether private or public? Even after all the experience which half a century has yielded me, of the manner in which men's actions are swayed, not by conscientious principles, but mostly by prejudices taken up almost at hazard, it has astonisht me to see how thousands,—I am afraid I do not exaggerate,—invested with the ministry of the Gospel, the ministry of love and reconciliation, have on this occasion rusht forward with blind, reckless impetuosity, to do what they could to condemn and crush a brother. Surely in such a matter we ought to act cautiously, deliberately, reluctantly. We ought to be slow in admitting a conviction, which brands a brother as a heretic, instead of running forward with breathless haste to embrace it.

I have been told indeed, that the addresses and remonstrances and protests of the Clergy do not involve a positive condemnation of Dr Hampden, but merely call for an enquiry to ascertain the real tendency of his writings, and that such a demand is amply warranted by the condemnation he has twice received from a majority of the Convocation at Oxford. This however is far from adequately expressing the bent of that spirit, which is now agitating our Church, and leading so many of our brethren into courses almost unprecedented; while dark threats are thrown out of ulterior, still more violent proceedings. The very demand for an enquiry in such a case, and such a tone, almost presumes a condemnation. Nor does it seem to me at all becoming our clerkly character, to pin our faith blindly to the tail of any extraneous decision, least of all to that of such a body as the Convocation of Oxford. For how many of the four hundred and seventy-four judges who assembled to condemn Dr Hampden in 1836, can we believe to have come with any competent

knowledge of the subject matter on which they were about to pronounce? Would it not be a large allowance to assume that one in ten did so? that one in ten had examined Dr Hampden's writings with that careful, candid, impartial scrutiny which ought to precede a judicial verdict? that one in ten knew much more of Dr Hampden than what he had gathered from the extracts selected, in whatsoever manner, by some of his most zealous opponents? Yet what but shame would be the doom of a judge in any legal court, who should give sentence on a single *ex parte* statement of the cause? What then can we say of those who think fit to follow at the heels of such ill-qualified judges, except that they are the blind following the blind, and thus cannot by any possibility go right? This conclusion seems to result of necessity from the constitution of such a court as the Convocation of Oxford, when it assumes the right of condemning persons as heretics. And he who has observed the occurrences at that University during the last fifteen years, must have perceived that they are markt, not only by the violence, but no less by the variableness and waywardness, which are the characteristics of a popular tribunal. They who ostracize Themistocles one year, are ready to ostracize Aristides the next. The only way to prevent such alternations, such changeful gusts of party-feeling, which are nowhere more unbecoming, nay, scandalous and mischievous, than on the judgement-seat, is, that all judicial questions, above all, questions so difficult and complicated as those of heresy, requiring so much historical research, so much philosophical and theological knowledge, and such an impartial weighing of every word in its connexion, not only with the immediate context, but also with the general purport of a work, should be tried before a special court, properly constituted for the purpose,

where they may be certain of meeting with a calm, deliberate, full investigation. And here it is natural to ask, why, if Dr Hampden's heresies are so manifest, as they must needs be deemed by those who are passing such a summary condemnation on him, why has the charge of heresy never been brought against him before the proper Ecclesiastical Court? Why has he been allowed to discharge his office for eleven years, inoculating our students of divinity with his heretical doctrines, when his opponents, who burn with such zeal for the preservation of orthodoxy, might at any time, if their charges were legally tenable, have ensured his condemnation and consequent deprivation? This can hardly have arisen from any over-indulgent forbearance on their part, but seems to imply, that, however confident they were in their assertions, they had a strong suspicion that they should fail in making out a case against him.

Nor, for my own part, do I understand why such a course should not be adopted now. If Dr Hampden has indeed been guilty of heresy, let him be proceeded against according to the regular forms of our Ecclesiastical Law. This is a simple and easy course, honest and straightforward; and we may feel sure that Dr Hampden would not attempt to baffle such proceedings by mere technical objections. It would greatly add to his peace of mind, if the question were thus set at rest. But I cannot see why the whole Church should be convulst from the Land's End to Newcastle, why every minister in every parish should be disturbed in the quiet discharge of his pastoral duties, in order to call upon the Crown to institute such an enquiry. Is it wisht that Dr Hampden should indict himself for heresy? or is the Crown to do so? But the Crown, by the very act of its appointment, has declared that it does not believe him to be chargeable with any such offense.

The task of indicting him should surely fall on those who do believe him guilty, not on those who do not.

On the grounds above stated, I felt that I could not exonerate myself from my own personal responsibility in this matter, by throwing it off upon the decision of the University of Oxford. Moreover, if we call to mind when that decision was first past, and what was the state of feeling in our Church, especially among the Clergy, at that time,—how, for several years after the conflicts of the Reform Bill, political party-spirit seemed to sway all minds, to the casting overboard of candour and discretion, until it was gradually superseded by ecclesiastical and theological party-spirit,—how almost everybody was so agitated and warpt by political and ecclesiastical anxieties, by fears, first of the overthrow of the Constitution, and then of the overthrow of the Church, as to be almost incapacitated for a calm estimate of the theological opinions held by a political and ecclesiastical opponent,—when we call to mind that he, whose name now stands higher perhaps in the esteem and admiration and reverence of England, than any other man of our generation, my dear and magnanimous friend Dr Arnold, was in those days a butt for all manner of scurrilous reproach, poured out upon him by none so profusely as by his clerical brethren,—when we call to mind, I say, what injustice was committed by the same class of persons at the selfsame time in the case of Dr Arnold, it cannot be invidious to think that the verdict which was then past on a friend of Dr Arnold's, may now need revision.

At all events, even without these special grounds for distrust, when eleven years so eventful in our Church, eleven years which have wrought such changes in the opinions of so many among our brethren, have elapst since Dr Hampden's condemnation,—seeing moreover that he

himself during that period has not let his pen lie dry, but has exprest his views again and again on several of the main points of Christian doctrine,—common fairness requires, that, before we renew the condemnation of what he preacht in the year 1832, we should take some account of the writings on the same or cognate subjects which he has publisht since. Or, when everything else has changed, are we determined that our passions, our animosities, our bitterness, our jealousies, our suspicions shall remain unchanged and unchangeable? Can we allow no appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober, even after eleven years?

These various reasons led me to say that I must pause to examine into the matter, before I could take any step condemnatory of Dr Hampden's appointment. In deploring that appointment, I entirely concurred with you, adding that you could not deplore it, you could not condemn it, more than I did, as a most injudicious measure on the part of the Minister by whom he was appointed,—as a wanton outrage to the feelings, prejudices they might be, but still strong and earnest feelings, of a large body of the Church, especially of the Clergy,—as an act which would infallibly arouse vehement opposition, and break up the peace of the Church, at a time when we were hoping for something like a lull, after the storms of the late years, and which, in the present state of morbid excitement, might even be pleaded by many as an excuse for running into the Romish Schism. On these grounds I would have implored the Minister, on my knees, if it could have been of any avail, to recall what seemed to me an act of folly almost amounting to madness, of which I have never been able to learn the slightest explanation or defense. Greatly too should I have rejoiced to hear that Dr Hampden had declined an office, whereby it was plain that he must give such offense to so many of his brethren, coming among

them as an object of general suspicion and aversion, instead of being regarded, as a bishop ought to be, with confidence and love. By so doing he would best have consulted his own honour, and would probably have turned the current of opinion in his favour. But, however strongly I regretted and condemned the appointment on these grounds, these are not grounds to warrant a public protest against him. They might warrant a private remonstrance on the part of those who have the means of making one; but a public protest could only proceed on the plea that he has been guilty of heresy. This guilt however I could not assume, unless on the verdict of a competent tribunal, without a careful searching and sifting of his writings.

Even as a private clergyman, I should not hold myself justified in doing so; for even a private clergyman cannot divest himself of his individual responsibility in such an act. If a private clergyman urges that he has not the leisure, or the theological learning, requisite for such enquiries; *Be it so,* I would answer; *but then your course is plain and straightforward: you have pronounced yourself disqualified for taking part in this controversy; and you may be thankful that you have so valid a reason for refraining from it.* O that our clergy did indeed feel the awful weight of this obligation! How would it narrow the range of our theological disputes! how much more easily and speedily might they be settled! at all events, how little in comparison would the peace of the Church be disturbed! if we all scrupulously abstained from engaging in them, unless we had carefully and conscientiously taken pains to fit ourselves with the knowledge requisite for understanding their various bearings. Even as a private clergyman, I say, I should have held it incumbent on me to ascertain Dr Hampden's demerits, before I

proceeded to condemn him; and I should not have said so much on this point, which might have been deemed, and ought to be self-evident, unless I had known of such a multitude of persons acting in utter disregard of the rule just laid down. But of course, in my position, where I was not only to express my own individual opinion, but to call on a large body of my brethren to adopt it, and take a deliberate public act in conformity to it, I should have deserved that the condemnation of Dr Hampden should recoil on my own head, if I had acted hastily and inconsiderately.

It is true, a Paper was laid on the table at the meeting of Convocation, and distributed to several of the members, which profest to give a series of propositions out of Dr Hampden's writings; and we were called upon in the Lower House to make some kind of remonstrance against his appointment to the episcopate, on the strength of these extracts. Of them I shall have to speak anon. But you, I believe, concurred with me in thinking that it was unbecoming the dignity of Convocation, and that it would only have shewn our unfitness for the functions of a deliberative assembly, if we had come to any resolution founded on mere rumour of what had taken place at Oxford, or on such a series of extracts set before us by an individual member of our body. You coincided with me, I believe, in holding that the only course which it would have behoved us to take, if we had been permitted to act, would have been to appoint a Committee specially charged to examine into Dr Hampden's writings, and to report to us thereon. Knowing, as every one must, who is at all acquainted with the history of any literary, above all, of theological controversies, how easy it is for an ardent advocate to wrest the words of his opponent into meaning something very different from, and almost

opposite to, what their writer intended them to mean,—nay, knowing how very difficult, how almost impossible it is for a person, under a strong religious bias, not grievously to misrepresent his adversary, — knowing this from general history, and, as I have had more than one painful occasion of knowing it, from my own personal experience of the shifts and tricks to which the very best men will have recourse in such warfare,—I could not attach much importance to the series of extracts placed in our hands. For might we not constrain the Bible itself to inculcate atheism, by taking four words out of the first verse of the fifty-third Psalm, and command us to sin, by separating the first three words from the last two in our Lord's injunction to the woman taken in adultery? Alas! this is scarcely an exaggeration of what may often be seen in theological polemics.

In order to enter upon the investigation which was thus imposed upon me, I desired my bookseller to send me Dr Hampden's theological publications; but some accidental delays prevented my receiving them till ten days after our conversation on the subject; and thus I have been compelled to defer informing you of the conclusion I have been led to. Had that conclusion prompted me to act as you appeared to wish, my act would have been the most appropriate answer. But, inasmuch as I have been brought to a totally opposite result, I feel a kind of obligation to tell you why I cannot concur in the proceeding which you recommended; and since that result is in like manner repugnant to the spirit by which so many of our brethren are agitated, with very little, and often, I am afraid, with no cognisance of any reasonable ground for their agitation, it seems to me advisable to send you my answer in this public form. Nay, a necessity seems to be laid upon me to do what I can, if I can do anything, to dispell these

clouds of gloomy suspicion and restless irritation, which are darkening our Church. Most fortunate too do I count it, that, in so doing, I have the privilege of addressing a person for whom I entertain, as all who know you must, such sincere esteem and regard. For thus, I trust, I may be enabled, under God's help, to repress those intemperances of feeling and expression, into which controversy so readily lapses.

Now one of the impressions which have been produced on me by Dr Hampden's Bampton Lectures, is thankfulness for having become acquainted with a work so learned and thoughtful, and so favorably distinguisht both in these respects, and by its philosophical candour and sobriety, from the bulk of our recent theological literature. I do not mean that I agree with him on all points. Our minds have been trained in very different schools; and so our judgements often differ on questions of philosophy and taste, and even of theology. This however is not the matter before us. Heretics, you may remind me, have not seldom been learned and thoughtful. On the other hand the utmost diversity of opinion in the region of philosophy or taste supplies no ground for a charge of heresy; and there may be wide theological divergences without overleaping the bounds of orthodoxy. The question however which concerns us at present is, Has not Dr Hampden promulgated opinions which do overleap those bounds, and which are at variance with the Creeds and Articles of our Church? In a word, is there no heresy in Dr Hampden's writings? To such a question it is not easy to reply with an absolute negative. It would be a long and laborious task to hunt out every inkling of a heresy through every clause of every sentence, in a long, learned, and argumentative volume. For most persons it would be a wholesomer occupation to hunt out the heresies that lurk

within their own breast, and to exterminate them: and several of Dr Hampden's most pertinacious adversaries would be far more profitably employed, if, instead of trying to pull out, or rather, to thrust in the motes in his eye, they were to set about casting the beams out of their own eyes. The business of the counsel for the defendant is not to shew that his client has never been guilty of any offense, but to rebut those with which he is charged: and this, as to the main part of the charges which have come under my notice on the present occasion, will not be difficult: they will fall before us like a row of card soldiers. But before I enter upon them, let me premise a couple of remarks, which will shew how easy it was for many of his expressions to be misunderstood and misrepresented, while they will also shew how unfit the main part of his condemners are for passing sentence upon him.

A very small portion, I believe, of these condemners has any correct notion of the nature and purport of the work which they are so eager to condemn. It is a historical, more than a dogmatical work, a work of historical and philosophical criticism applied to an important period in the development of Christian Theology, professing in its title to consider the Scholastic Philosophy in its relation to Christian Theology, that is, to point out how that Philosophy, which exercised such power in the Church for several centuries, modified the development of our Theology, how it led to the construction of systems in which at one time one doctrine, at another time another doctrine, was wrought out with great subtilty into all its logical consequences, and how the traces of this Philosophy, even after it has so long been exploded, are still discernible in our symbolical books, especially in their terminology. To this latter point he often turns, taking a particular interest, as men of philosophical habits of thought are wont to do, in tracing the

coinage of obsolete systems in the language of after generations. As to every reflecting mind it is pleasant to recognise relics of the Astrology of the middle ages in such words as *jovial*, *mercurial*, *saturnine*, so Dr Hampden will often stop to point out how still in our theological language we use the words of the Schoolmen, even when the notions implied in those words have long been abandoned. As he says, in the Introduction to the Second Edition of his Lectures (p. xxiii.), his discussions "have to do, not with any explanations of the Christian verities or doctrines, as such,—as they exist,—as they are revealed,—but with the language and forms of expression in which they are conveyed in theological systems."

Further, Dr Hampden is led by his subject to consider the effects which the love of system-making has produced on Theology; and he has a strong conviction of the evils it has wrought: nor can an intelligent student of the history of Theology well arrive at any other conclusion. The same conviction has been exprest strongly and repeatedly, in two of the most precious works of our age, *the Aids to Reflexion*, and *the Kingdom of Christ*. Coleridge has shewn how the love of system-making has given rise to inextricable controversies concerning Free-will and Necessity, Predestination and Election, in which spiritual realities are denied, because logical consequences have been drawn from them which contradict one another: and Dr Hampden enters into a like discussion, and also shews how consequences deduced from the abstract notion of Unity lie at the bottom of all the Anti-Trinitarian heresies, from Arius down to Priestley. In fact, this is one side of the great truth whereby Bacon regenerated Physical Science, and corresponds in great measure with the work which Socrates and Plato wrought in Greek Philosophy.

It may be that Dr Hampden, according to the wont of

all men, philosophers as well as others, may sometimes exaggerate the importance of his favorite proposition, and may push it too far. Still he is no way insensible to the utility and the necessity of sound logic, to counteract the mischiefs of unsound. Thus, he says, in his Introduction (p. lxv.), that Athanasius "admits that Scripture intimations of the truth would be better, as being more accurate; but that the versatility of the Arian party had obliged the bishops assembled at Nice to set forth more plainly such expressions as subverted the heretical impiety. In the same way I hold that the technical language of Theology has been both useful and necessary for maintaining the truth; whilst I point out its human origin, and connexion with the reasonings of ancient philosophy. Indeed I have said, and still think, that there is an advantage in the use of this technical language over the actual words of Scripture, for stating points of doctrine; since we can modify it as we please, and limit it accurately to the meaning we wish to express."

In consequence of his strong sense of the evils produced by logic in its uncontrolled exercise on theological questions, we often find Dr Hampden urging that the only sure ground to stand on is the Facts declared in Scripture. This expression is liable to misconstruction, and, I believe, is one of the chief causes of the suspicion he has incurred. For if by *facts* he had meant the mere outward occurrences narrated in the Bible, his theology might readily have coincided with the baldest Unitarianism. In preaching to a common congregation indeed, it would have been very injudicious to use such a term in any other than its ordinary sense. But, as he was preaching to the University of Oxford, he thought he might assume, that, notwithstanding their adherence to the

philosophy of Aristotle, they would understand the Baconian use of the word, which the context in several passages plainly sets forth; as, where he says (p. 150), that the discussions he had been engaged in "evidence the reality of those sacred *Facts* of Divine Providence which we comprehensively denote by the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity." From this and many other passages, it is clear that he used the word as he interprets it in his Introduction (p. xl.). "To persons who have thoroughly entered into the spirit of the Inductive Philosophy, it would be unnecessary to explain what I mean by this term. Such persons would know that this term is not to be restricted to mere events or occurrences, or what may be called historical or singular facts, but denotes WHATEVER IS, Universal as well as Particular Truths, whether founded on Experience, or on the authority of Divine Revelation, and that it is opposed to Theory or Hypothesis. Thus the Divinity of our Lord is a Fact: His Consubstantiality with the Father and the Holy Spirit, His Atonement, His Mediation, His distinct Personality, His perpetual presence with His Church, His future Advent to judge the world, the Communion of Saints, the Corruption of our Nature, the Efficacy of Divine Grace, the Acceptableness of Works wrought through Faith, the Necessity of Repentance,—though stated in abstract terms,—are all Facts in God's spiritual kingdom, revealed to us through Christ. So I might proceed to enumerate, one after the other, all the Christian verities. But these instances may shew that it is not merely such Truths as our Lord's Birth, and Crucifixion, and Resurrection, and Ascension, and the Miracles which He wrought, and the Descent of the Holy Ghost, or the Call of Abraham, and the Thunders of Sinai, and the Dedication of the Temple, that come under the appellation of Facts, in the philosophical sense of that

term.—Nothing was further from my thoughts than to say that Christianity is made up wholly of mere Events, and has no Doctrinal Truths in it." In the next paragraphs Dr Hampden proceeds to vindicate his use of the word *Fact;* and in a note to his Inaugural Lecture he supports it by a quotation from Butler's *Analogy*. Of course I cannot enter into a discussion on this and the other points which I shall have to bring forward. To do so would swell out this Letter into a thick volume. My purpose is merely to shew what Dr Hampden really meant, and that his meaning, however it has been misinterpreted, is not heretical.

Here, in order to meet the charges against him, it becomes desirable to know what they really are. This knowledge, I believe, one might vainly seek from nine-tenths of the persons so forward in condemning him, who seem to think that the best way of proving their orthodoxy, is to rush blindfold to hunt down a heretic. Thus one man calls him a Socinian, another an Arian, a third a Sabellian,—accusations which, like the monsters in a drop of water, destroy one another, and which the foregoing extracts, I trust, go far to disprove. To come to something more definite, let us take the Paper which was put into our hands at the meeting of Convocation. It is the only distinct embodiment of the charges against him which has fallen under my notice on this occasion; and, as it has been revived, after lying dormant for more than eleven years, one is led to suppose that it must possess a more than ordinary vitality. Of what kind that vitality is, we shall see soon. For vitality is not always a proof of inherent worth. The poet has told us: "Ah, sir, the good die first; And they, whose hearts are dry as summer dust, Burn to the socket."

That Paper consists of three parts. The first is the reprint

of a Declaration made by Resident Members of the Convocation of Oxford, in March, 1836. This is followed by a statement of certain reasons for its republication. And then comes a series of Propositions purporting to be taken from Dr Hampden's works, to establish the charges of heresy. On each of these parts I shall have to speak in succession.

The Declaration sets forth certain strong objections to the appointment of Dr Hampden as Professor of Divinity. I have no wish to meddle with the controversies of that period; but he who has republisht and circulated it now, and who distributed it the other day among the members of Convocation, in order to excite them to some kind of remonstrance against Dr Hampden's appointment to the episcopate, has thereby made himself responsible for its veracity. Now in this Declaration, after some general terms of condemnation, it is said: "We cannot allow any explanations of insulated passages or particular words to be valid in excuse against the positive language, the systematic reasonings, and the depreciating tone, with which, in Dr Hampden's works, the Articles of our Church are described as mere human speculations, the relics of a false and exploded philosophy, full at once of error and mischief." Here one can hardly help smiling, when one calls to mind how strangely the theological weathercock has veered round at Oxford, since the opponents of Dr Hampden were so zealous in asserting the honour of the Thirty-nine Articles. Many who pointed due East then, even, it may be, the very writer of this Declaration, have long been pointing due West. But, passing over this, we may easily be convinced, by an examination of Dr Hampden's writings, that the assertions here made against him are untrue. He does not describe the Articles of our Church, "in a depreciating tone, as mere human speculations, the relics of a false and

exploded philosophy." Human speculations of course they are, so far as they are merely deduced from Scripture by the processes of human reasoning; nor have I heard of any one who has claimed a higher origin for them, even at Oxford. Though they may have been called the Palladium of our Church, no legend of their having fallen down from heaven has come to my ears. But it is not the Articles of our Church, that Dr Hampden describes as the relics of a false and exploded philosophy; those terms are only applied by him to certain parts of the technical language in which they are exprest. In the Introduction already referred to, which naturally gives a more explicit account of the author's views on the points urged against him, and which, though it was not publisht till after the original Declaration, ought to have been examined by a person taking upon himself to revive it, Dr Hampden says: "As for explaining away language, that we have solemnly adopted, and still retain, I consider such a proceeding as dishonest. And, so far from condemning [these statements of Christian truths], I conceive the adoption of them by the Church as fully defensible. I believe that the leaders of the Church did well, and could do no otherwise, at the time when they sanctioned the introduction of our present Theological Language; acting to the best of their judgement for the Church, in its capacity of keeper of Holy Writ and Judge of Controversy. I would even go so far as to say, that, whilst theological terms are essentially mutable, and therefore ought to be altered, should circumstances require it, yet, what the ancient rhetorician observes of them is true, as a general rule; *illa mutari vetat Religio; et consecratis utendum est.*" Should any simple reader be startled by this assertion, that "theological terms are essentially mutable," in its application to the Creeds of the Church, I would

beg him to call to mind how greatly the three Catholic Creeds differ, not indeed in doctrine, but in their mode of stating their doctrine, and how, in the middle of her second millennary, it became necessary for the Church, wherever she desired to return to primitive purity of doctrine, to draw up new and more explicit Confessions of Faith.

To the same effect in the latter part of his eighth Lecture, where Dr Hampden speaks expressly on this subject, he says: "Dogmas of theology, then, *as such*, are human authorities. But do I mean to say by this that they are unimportant in religion?—I wish rather to establish their importance and proper truth, as distinct from the honour and verity of the simple Divine word. We have seen how doctrines gradually assume their form by the successive impressions of controversy. The Facts of Scripture remain the same through all ages,—not so the theories raised upon them. They have floated on the stream of speculation. One heresiarch after another has proposed his modification.—In such a state of things it was impossible for the Scriptural theologian—to refrain from mingling in the conflict of argument. Orthodoxy was forced to speak the Divine Truth *in the terms of heretical speculation;* if it were only to guard against the novelties which the heretic had introduced. It was the necessity of the case that compelled the orthodox, as themselves freely admit, to employ a phraseology by which, as experience proves, the naked Truth of God has been overborne and obscured. Such being the origin of a Dogmatic Theology, it follows that its proper truth consists in its being a collection of negations;—of negations, I mean, of all ideas imported into religion, beyond the express sanction of revelation. Supposing that there had been no theories proposed on the truths of Christianity; were the Bible, or rather the Divine Facts which it reveals, at once ushered

into our notice without our knowing that various wild notions, both concerning God and human nature, had been raised upon the sacred truths, no one, I conceive, would wish to see those Facts reduced to the precision and number of Articles, any more than he now thinks of reducing any other history to such a form. We should rather resist any such attempt as futile, if not as profane; or, however judiciously such a selection might be made, we should undoubtedly prefer the living records of the Divine agency, to the dry and uninteresting abstracts of human compilers and expositors. But, when theoretic views are known to have been held and propagated, when the world has been familiarized to the language of these speculations, and the truth of God is liable to corruption from them, then it is that forms of exclusion become necessary, and theory must be retorted by theory. This very occasion however of the introduction of theory into religion suggests the limitation of it. It must be strictly confined to the exclusion and rejection of all extraneous notions from the subjects of the sacred volumes. Theory, thus regulated, constitutes a true and valuable philosophy, not of Christianity, properly so called, but of human Christianity, of Christianity in the world, as it has been acted on by the force of the human intellect. This is the view which I take, not only of our Articles at large, but, in particular, of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds.—If it be admitted that *the notions on which their several expressions are founded are both unphilosophical and unscriptural*, it must be remembered that they do not impress those notions on the faith of the Christian, as matters of affirmative belief; they only use the *terms of ancient theories of philosophy*, theories current in the schools at the time they were written, to exclude others more obviously injurious to the simplicity of the faith. The speculative language of these

Creeds—was admitted into the Church of England, as establisht by the Reformers, before the period when the genius of Bacon exposed the emptiness of the system, which the Schools had palmed upon the world as the only instrument for the discovery of all truth.—The minds of men would be fully pre-occupied with the notions of *matter*, and *form*, and *substance*, and *accident:* and when such notions had produced misconception of the sacred truth, it would be a necessary expedient to correct that misconception by a less exceptionable employment of them." Dr Hampden then goes on to give the reasons why he thinks that *the occasion for Articles will probably never cease*, (pp. 375—380.) In this passage there is some questionable matter, especially about the real value of Dogmatical Theology; but no one acquainted with the history of Theology will controvert the statement here given of the origin of the definitions contained in our Creeds and Articles, though its application to the Nicene Creed is very narrow; and the whole passage shews that it is the terminology of those documents that the author speaks of as the relics of a false and exploded philosophy.

In the next paragraph but one of the Declaration it is said: "We now solemnly protest against principles which impugn and injure the Word of God as a revealed Rule of Faith and Practice, in its sense and use, its power and perfection." Verily this does bespeak no ordinary effrontery, to bring forward an accusation of this kind against a divine, the object of whose writings is to assert the exclusive honour of the Scriptures, as the sole infallible depository of Divine Truth. This is implied in the whole passage I have just quoted, and runs through the entire work. Thus, when speaking, in the Introduction, of what he calls the universal Facts of Christianity, the author says (p. xliii): "Let there be but the evidence that God has spoken it; and

the thing said is as real as if it had been the object of our experience. Christ's Intercession with the Father, for example, though it is going on at this moment, and will go on until the consummation of all things, is a certain Fact; we see not its beginning, or its end, or its process. But God's Word has declared that it is so; and this is enough. We may call it therefore, in the strictest sense, a revealed Fact. Again, that God worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure, or that we have no power of ourselves to do any good thing without His preventing and co-operating Grace, this is a revealed fact, a truth of God's invisible kingdom, ever in course of accomplishment, ever being realized. That our Lord is both Perfect God and Perfect Man, in one Person, or, as it is technically exprest, the doctrine of the Hypostatic Union, is in like manner a fact of the Gospel." Here we see moreover that, though the author elsewhere says, that the terms, *preventing and co-operating Grace*, and *the Hypostatic Union*, are derived from the notions of an exploded philosophy, he no way purposes thereby to question or disparage the truths involved in them.

Besides, in his *Inaugural Lecture* (p. 15), where he speaks of "the authorities and the course of religious study to which his whole theological instruction will have reference," he says: "Let me then at once state, that I purpose leading my hearers to the Scriptures themselves, as the sole supreme Authority of all revealed Truth. When I see in the Bible itself, how exclusively it reserves to itself the right of declaring the truth of God,—when I find it asserting its own sufficiency and certainty in making us wise unto salvation,—when I observe our Lord Himself citing the Scriptures of the Old Testament as decisive authorities, His Apostles also appealing to them, the primitive converts commended for their zeal in searching

the Scriptures, our Lord again characterizing them as testifying of Him, St Paul approving Timothy for having known the Scriptures from a child,—looking to these facts, and to the practice also of the early Church, in all its controversies, of deciding by the testimony of the written word, I cannot admit any other authority, as approaching at all to the weight and sanctity of the Evidence of Scripture. I should feel myself untrue to the great principle of Protestantism, which broke the seals of the Bible, and opened wide its pages to the reading of every Christian man; I should feel myself also untrue to the teaching of the Church of England, which so strongly declares that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation;—if, I say, with these strong assertions of the paramount authority of the Bible, I should receive any other authority as a legitimate source of Divine truth, I should convict myself of deserting the cause of Protestantism, and of our own Church, no less than the cause of the Bible itself. I shall be imperatively called upon by my duty therefore, in this chair of Theology, to lead the student to be diligent in prayer, and in reading of the Holy Scripture, and especially to employ his mind in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same. It will be my pride to train him to be mighty in the Scriptures, so that he may at his command draw forth by God's blessing 'the waters out of these living wells.'—At all times it becomes us to entertain a holy jealousy of encroachment on the supremacy of Scripture; so apt is human reason, under some form or other, to lift itself up to a usurped importance, and to derogate from the exclusive sanctity of the Divine Word. We ought therefore to watch with anxious care, above all things, that precious deposit of the oracles of God, especially committed to our veneration and care.—It is only in subordination, in humble and devout subordina-

tion, to the Divine Word itself, that the Church has received its sacred commission. The word only which the Scripture puts into its mouth, can the Church utter as the word of Divine Revelation. To the Law and to the Testimony is its appeal. To the caviler and objector its only answer is, It is written." Now this Lecture was delivered just a week after the date of the Declaration. It was publisht immediately, and circulated rapidly, so that it soon reacht a fourth edition. Yet the Declaration, which charges Dr Hampden with principles impugning and injuring the word of God as a revealed rule of faith and practice, does not appear to have been modified, but doubtless received many signatures of persons who went and voted in Convocation against him on this ground. And now, after eleven years, during which, so far at least as we can form any judgement from his subsequent writings, he has been discharging his office according to the rules he had here laid down for himself, this accusation, which from the first was utterly groundless, which was in direct contradiction to the whole spirit of his Bampton Lectures, is brought forward again, without a word of explanation, or limitation, or even an additional argument in support of it. Clamour on the part of the accusers, Ignorance on that of their hearers,—in which it is to be hoped that the accusers themselves have no small share,—these are the powers relied on to bar his way to the Episcopate, the two uncouth, unwieldy giants that throw their clubs across his path.

In the second part of the Paper which I am examining, there is little to detain us. After speaking, in temperate terms, of the reasons for reviving the attack on Dr Hampden, the writer says: "For this purpose some of the passages in Dr Hampden's works, on which his disqualification rests, are here reprinted from the Report of the

Committee appointed to select them. It is not denied that extracts alone will not always afford a just estimate of a whole work; but the necessity of resorting to them is unavoidable; nor is there any reason to suppose that those now given are otherwise than fairly quoted; while by affixing to them their respective references, the opportunity is afforded to the reader to judge for himself by referring to the works in question. The point to be borne in mind is, that the opinions professed in these passages have never been recalled, nor the positions maintained in them abandoned." In these sentences there are two points that I will just notice.

First, the writer says that "there is no reason to suppose the extracts given are otherwise than fairly quoted." So reckless is party-spirit in these days, that a person will bring forward the gravest accusations against a divine, who has filled, and has been selected to fill, such high offices in the Church, before a solemn assembly, and will call on that assembly to act upon them, without taking the trouble to examine whether the passages which he adduces as the grounds of them are correct; and this too, after it was notorious that the accuracy of the quotations made by Dr Hampden's adversaries in 1836 had been denied, and after their inaccuracy had been exposed by Mr Hull, in a pamphlet written with his unvarying conscientious love of truth. The writer does indeed say, that the references will enable his readers to verify the extracts: but how many of his readers did he expect to take this trouble, when he himself did not? Nay, how many would even have the means of doing so? Is it become a valid excuse for uttering a falsehood, according to our modern casuistry, that the hearer, by due enquiry, may disprove it?

In the next place, when it is said that Dr Hampden has

never recalled his opinions, it should at least have been added, that he has disclaimed them. He could not recant opinions, which, in the Introduction prefixt to the second edition of his Lectures, he denied having ever held. Even Papal infallibility is esteemed by all the sober members of the Romish Church, to extend merely to doctrine, not to fact. When it condemns a doctrine, it cannot err. But on the question whether the doctrine condemned is held by such or such a man, it is liable to human fallibility. And after the slovenly manner in which the whole accusation against Dr Hampden had been conducted, there was little reason for him to suppose that his adversaries understood his meaning better than he did himself. The very calmness and mildness of his vindication is a strong presumption in its favour, especially when we consider the provocations he had received; and though it has been asserted that the Introduction is inconsistent with the Lectures, no intelligent and candid person, I think, can read it, without a conviction that the whole line of thought is precisely the same; though of course it brings out particular points, the points which had been misunderstood, and which required explanation, more prominently and explicitly.

Moreover, in his *Inaugural Lecture*, after declaring his belief in the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, he adds (p. 8): "To this sublime confession I have solemnly and devoutly been pledged in infancy by the fostering care of the Church; and to the same in the mature age of reflexion I have as solemnly and devoutly set my hand; and I reverentially appeal to the Searcher of hearts, as a witness, that I have never for one moment swerved from this true faith of the Gospel, but that the more I have enquired into Scripture, —the more conversant I have become with theological antiquity,—the more I have laboured to know of the doctrine

whether it be of God, by improving in doing the will of God,—the more I have been convinced that the Trinitarian doctrine profest by our Church is the true one, that it cannot be denied without expunging the Scriptures themselves, and unlearning every lesson which inspired Prophets and Evangelists and Preachers have taught us. In what I have ever written, or said, or thought, on theological subjects, I have constantly had this deep conviction of the sacred Truth present to my mind. Whether I have been engaged in speculative discussion, or in practical teaching, I have had in view to bring it home to the understanding, so far as such a mystery could be brought home to the understanding, free from glosses and misconstructions, and to the heart in all its winning persuasiveness to holiness and divine consolation. I will not pretend always to have stated my conviction in the fullest, clearest manner, so as to have avoided all possibility of misinterpretation. I will not claim to have been invariably accurate in the use of words, or to have anticipated every possible objection that could be raised against particular modes of statement. Nor again can I presume that I have always made my practical aim so distinct and so direct to the heart, as invariably to have hit the object in view.—Especially too where a recondite track of observation is pursued, where the meaning of controversial statements is to be disentangled, and the thread of obsolete speculations and reasonings to be recovered, there will in all probability be an opening for misunderstanding on the part of others, on whom the light of his researches falls but dimly amidst the surrounding shadows. Still, if there is a real desire on the part of the teacher to inculcate the truth, there must be a natural interpretation of my words consistent with such desire, and distinct from the perverse sense which has been drawn from them. If then I am candidly judged

by this my real intention, it will be found that in nothing have I departed from the true Catholic faith of the Trinity, but that, on the contrary, I have made it my ground-plan of theological instruction throughout, the fundamental true assumption on which my argument proceeds in every theological discussion. And now, as Theological Professor, can I have any other object proposed to me, but to guard this sacred deposit with all fidelity and diligence? May God forbid that anything I may say or do in the discharge of this trust, should have any other effect, but to strengthen and extend the knowledge of the Revelation of God through Jesus Christ, the mystery of the Trinity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, one God blessed for evermore." This is not strictly a recantation indeed; because Dr Hampden was not conscious of having anything to recant. But the best, and only really valuable recantation is the confession of the truth. When St Paul preacht the faith, which aforetime he had laboured to destroy, there was no need of any further recantation in words. Even if Dr Hampden had been led fifteen years ago by his speculative tendencies into certain erroneous refinements concerning the nicer points of doctrine, this should hardly be visited upon him as a grave offense now, provided all his more recent writings have been orthodox. But he says, "The truths, which you conceive me to have impugned, I hold, and have ever held, with all my heart and mind. I have endeavoured to make them the principles and ground-work of all my teaching. In following them out in a curious historical and theological enquiry, I may sometimes have exprest myself inaccurately, often obscurely, and thus have afforded room for misinterpretations. These however are questions which can only be brought to an issue by a learned and precise discussion.

If I have said anything contrary to these truths, it was equally contrary to the purpose of my soul. The truths themselves I held then, I hold now, and, so help me God, will hold to my life's end." What kind of recantation do his enemies want, if they will not be satisfied with this? Do they want him to stand in a white sheet, or to kneel before them and kiss their toes? And what example have they set him in this matter? Has one of the falsehoods which have been uttered against him, been retracted? Have they not been repeated again and again? and are they not called up now as bitter and as fierce as ever?

But it is time to enter into a more specific examination of these charges. That I may do so as thoroughly as I can, I will here insert the whole series of Propositions, which form the third part of the paper laid before us, numbering them for the facility of reference. They are entitled "Propositions maintained in Dr Hampden's Work."

1. *Dialectical Science* . . . established that peculiar phraseology which we now use, in speaking of the Sacred Trinity as *Three Persons* and *One God*.—p. 130.

2. The whole discussion [on the Blessed Trinity] was fundamentally dialectical.—p. 104.

3. No one can pretend to that exactness of thought on the subject of the Holy Trinity, on which our technical language is based.—p. 150.

4. Revelation teaches us only, that God has manifested Himself *relatively to us*, as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.—Sup.

5. Unitarians, in that they acknowledge the great fundamental facts of the Bible, do not really differ *in religion* from other Christians.—Observ. pp. 20, 21.

6. There is much of the language of Platonism in the speculation on the Generation of the Son, and the Procession of the Holy Spirit.—p. 117.

7. The orthodox language, declaring the Son "*begotten* before all worlds

of one substance (sic) with the Father," was settled by a philosophy, wherein the principles of different sciences were confounded.—p. 137.

8. The divine part of Christianity is its facts: the received statements of doctrines are only episodic additions, some out of infinite theories which may be raised on the texts of Scripture.—p. 390.

9. The application of the term punishment to the *sacrifice* of our Saviour belongs to the Aristotelic philosophy.—p. 250.

10. The bane of this *philosophy of expiation* was, that it depressed the power of *man* too low.—p. 253.

11. Christ is emphatically *said* to be our Atonement, not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done, but that *we may know* (sic) that we have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him* (sic).—Ib.

12. "Atonement," in its true practical sense, expresses the fact, that we cannot be at peace without some consciousness of Atonement made, not that God may forgive us, but that we may forgive ourselves.—p. 252.

13. Our Saviour's mode of speaking, that *virtue* had gone out of Him, is characteristic of *the prevalent idea*, concerning the operation of Divine Influence, as of something passing from one body to another.—p. 315.

14. Our Saviour, in accompanying His miracles with significant actions, *condescended* to the prejudices of His followers, who believed that His word or His touch acted after the manner of secret agents in nature.—pp. 314, 315.

15. The imperfection of the writers [of Scripture] may accidentally infuse alloy into the character of the truths concerning God.—Observ. p. 15. (First Edit.)

16. We are not to take *the words or propositions written by the inspired writers* as the *substance* of the revelation, instead of looking to the *authenticated dealings of God in the world*.—Observ. p. 14. (First Edit.)

17. A reception of the Scripture, not simply as the living word of God, but as *containing* the sacred *propositions* of inspired wisdom, is an improperly directed veneration.—B. L. p. 91.

18. A participation of Deity, or an actual Deification of our nature, is the fundamental idea of the *operation* of *Grace* according to the Schoolmen, and is a pantheistic notion.—Comp. Θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως. 2 Pet. i. 4.—B. L. p. 197.

19. The notions on which the several expressions of the Articles at large, and in particular of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, are founded, are both unphilosophical and unscriptural, belong to ancient theories of

philosophy, and are only less obviously injurious to the simplicity of the Faith than those which they exclude.—p. 378.

20. The speculative language of these Creeds was admitted into the Church of England, as established by the Reformers, before the genius of Bacon exposed the *emptiness* of the system, which the Schools had palmed upon the world, as the only instrument for the discovery of all truth.—Ib.

21. The Nicene and Athanasian Creeds involve scholastic speculations.—p. 544.

22. All *opinion, as such, is involuntary in its nature.* It is only a *fallacy,* to invest dissent* in religion with the awe of the objects about which it is conversant.—Obs. p. 5.

23. The Orthodox ought to have contented themselves with the *name* of Original Sin, to designate the moral *fact* of the *tendency* (sic) to sin, in human nature.—p. 224.

24. The Pelagians asserted that the first sin was hurtful to the human race, not by *propagation,* but by *example:* though their language inadequately expresses the inveteracy of the sinfulness of human nature, *their grounds were right,* so far as they attempted to give a *moral* account of the fact; and *their opponents were wrong,* so far as they attempted to give a *physical* or *material* account of it.—pp. 222, 223.

25. A positive deterioration of our carnal nature is a Scholastic notion. —p. 225.

26. The idea, that the corruption of nature exists in infants, is the result of Theory.—p. 221.

27. The notion that Faith is a source of the knowledge of God, is derived from an eclectic philosophy, in which the mysticism of Plato was blended with the analytic method of Aristotle.—p. 80.

28. The conception produced in the mind by speaking of grace *operating* and *co-operating,* grace *preventing* and *following,* is very erroneous. —p. 187.

29. To regard Grace as something "infused" into the soul, by virtue of which the sinner is justified, and the operation of which on the heart is to be traced through the stages of its process, is part of the Scholastic system.—pp. 188, 189.

30. The doctrine of the Sacraments is based upon the mystical philosophy of secret agents in nature, Christianized.—pp. 314, 315.

---

* "Dissent," in Dr Hampden's language, includes Unitarianism.

31. The ready reception of the theory that Christ, as the sole primary cause of grace, conveyed that grace through the Sacraments, as subordinate instrumental causes by which the Divine agency accomplished *its* ends, is sufficiently accounted for by the general belief in magic, in the early ages of the Church.—Ib.

32. The notion that the Sacraments are visible channels, through which virtue is conveyed from Christ Himself to His mystical body, the Church, is part of the theoretic view of the Scholastic Philosophy.—p. 311.

33. The assertion of a real and true presence of Christ in the Eucharist resulted from the original *Platonism* of the Church.—p. 72.

34. The inquiries in our Baptismal Service, "With what *matter* was this child baptized?" "With *what words*," &c. "Because some things," it is said, "*essential* to this Sacrament may happen to be omitted," are derived from the subtle speculations about *matter* and *form*, introduced to establish and perfect the theory of *instrumental efficiency* ascribed to the rites themselves.—p. 336.

35. The use of the expressions, being made a "member of the body of Christ," or being "incorporated" ("engrafted into the Church," Art. XXVII.) as equivalent, is owing to the *confusion of ideas* prevalent in the early Church on the subject of Baptism.—pp. 324, 325.

36. The decision as to the intrinsic *efficacy* of the rite of Baptism can be only speculation.—p. 344.

37. The popular belief in the separate existence of the soul is a remnant of Scholasticism.—B. L. p. 310.

38. Observ. pp. 21, 22. "In truth, I say, it ought not to exist. Theological opinion, as necessarily mixed up with speculative knowledge, ought not to be the bond of union of any Christian Society, or a mark of discrimination between Christian and Christian. Wherever speculative truth is involved there must be presupposed an opening for improvement; whereas articles of religious communion, from their reference to the fixed objects of our faith, assume an immoveable character, fatally adverse to all theological improvement." See Observations, pp. 10, 18, 28, and Postscript to Observations, p. 10.

39. Observ. pp. 23, 24. "Are the doctrines [of the Church] *as expressed in our formularies* . . . precisely those which the primitive Church declared? . . . Granting, for the sake of argument, that the dogmas of the Church are precisely what they were in the earliest age of Christianity; or that such a coincidence, if it existed, would be a test of a perfect theology (which I do not admit); it is evident, at any rate, on examination,

that a great deal of the false philosophy of former times is involved in the expressions which convey them."

40. Observ. p. 20. "When I look at the reception by the Unitarians both of the Old and New Testament, I cannot, for my part, strongly as I dislike their theology, deny to those who acknowledge this basis of Divine facts the name of Christians."

41. Observ. pp. 20, 21. "Putting him, however, on the same footing precisely of earnest religious zeal and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, on which I should place any other Christian, I propose to him impartially to weigh with himself, whether it is not *theological dogmatism* and not *religious belief*, properly so called, which constitutes the principle of his dissent."

42. B. L. vii. p. 315. "The general belief in Magic, in the early ages of the Church, may sufficiently account for the ready reception of such a theory of sacramental influence (viz. the theory of inward grace working by outward signs). The maxim of Augustin, *Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit Sacramentum*, appears to be in fact an adaptation of the popular belief respecting the power of incantations and charms, to the subject of Religion. . . ."

This array seems formidable enough; but appearances, we know, are often deceitful, and never are they more so than when they are conjured up by the *Odium Theologicum*. Of these Propositions the first seven are placed together, as bearing more or less on the doctrine of the Trinity. Yet, with regard to some of them, one is at a loss to understand why they were cited; for they merely state facts, which every one acquainted with the history of Theology knows to be true. Did the citer,—for, though they were publisht by a Committee, the selection of them was probably assigned to one of its members; else at all events I may be excused, if I would rather impute the guilt of them to a single individual, than to many;—did the citer, I say, alledge them in honest ignorance? If so, he proves his incompetence for the work he undertook. Or did he know that they were innocent, and wish to impose on and frighten his readers, who might be alarmed at seeing

strange and obscure words and phrases connected with the primary truths of religion, and would perhaps fancy that the seeds of all heresy and infidelity lurkt in the notion that Philosophy can have anything to do with Theology? much as a simple man, with a glass of water at his mouth, might be terrified if he were told that he was drinking a combination of oxygen and hydrogen. Yet few persons have objected more strongly to such a union than Dr Hampden. He merely speaks of the historical fact, that it has often been attempted, though never, he thinks, without evil results. What, for instance, is there, except the statement of a historical fact, in the words "*Dialectical science* establisht that peculiar phraseology, which we now use in speaking of the sacred Trinity as *Three Persons and One God?*" Was the reader meant to infer that Dr Hampden had said, that the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity originated merely in *dialectical science?* He speaks only of the phraseology used in expressing that doctrine. "The disputation (he says, p. 130, speaking of the controversies in the fourth century), in its progress, turned upon the point, how far difference might be asserted, consistently with that sameness which constituted the Divine Unity of Being or Substance. It was enquired whether the distinction could be rightly exprest by *Hypostasis*, or *Persona;* whether the ideas involved in one, or the other of these terms did not import too express and real, or too shadowy a distinction. The difficulty here was, to avoid distinguishing the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in such a way as to represent them differing, as three angels, or three men differ from each other, and yet to preserve the real distinctions. Dialectical science furnisht the expedients in this difficulty, and establisht that peculiar phraseology which we now use in speaking of the sacred Trinity, as three Persons and One God." So much for our first heretical proposition.

The second is just akin to it. "The whole discussion on the blessed Trinity was fundamentally dialectical." Here again the only answer required is to adduce the passage out of which these words have been wrested. "What rendered these disputes more complex, was, that they were agitated whilst as yet an active intercourse subsisted between the Greek and Latin Churches, as members of one spiritual body. The Latins were unable—to reach the precision and compass of the Greek phraseology. But the Greeks, regarding their own tongue as the sacred idiom of philosophy and theology, strove to impose their own modes of thought, and their very words, on the reluctant sense of the Latins. Even among the Greeks themselves, disputes were multiplied, as each employed the principal terms of the controversy in a strictly philosophical, or in a popular acceptation; as the habits of thought in individuals were coloured with Oriental or Greek associations. So great indeed were the impediments arising from the varied use of Terms, where *the whole discussion was fundamentally dialectical*, that the measure of accommodation between those who really agreed with each other, would probably have failed in any other hands but those of Athanasius.—He seized the points of agreement between the contending parties, and by his wise and conciliatory policy secured at least a standard of orthodoxy for future ages of disputation, both to the East and the West (pp. 103. 104)." Who could have imagined that a heretical meaning would have been extorted from this passage, or that the words printed in italics would have been severed from the context as a ground for such a charge?

The third extract is still more dishonest. Dr Hampden closes his third Lecture by saying (p. 150): "I should hope the discussions, in which we have now been engaged, will leave this impression on the mind. Historically

regarded, they evidence the reality of those sacred facts of Divine Providence, which we comprehensively denote by the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity. But let us not identify this reality with the theories coucht under a logical phraseology. I firmly and devoutly believe that Word, which has declared the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But who can pretend to that exactness of thought on the subject, on which our technical language is based? Looking to the simple truth of Scripture, I would say, in the language of Augustin, *Haec scio. distinguere autem inter illam Generationem et hanc Processionem nescio, non valeo, non sufficio.—Verius enim cogitatur Deus, quam dicitur; et verius est, quam cogitatur.*" From this passage Dr Hampden's accuser extracts the words, "No one can pretend to that exactness of thought on the subject of the Holy Trinity on which our technical language is based." Thus he produces the impression of a mere negativeness, leaving out the declaration of faith which precedes, and the passage of Augustin which fully bears out the negation, and to which the accuser himself would not have dared to attach an odious meaning.

The fourth extract I have not been able to find; nor do I understand the reference. I have only the second edition of the Bampton Lectures, which, I am informed, is an exact reprint of the first, with the addition of the Introduction already spoken of. But it seems clear that Dr Hampden's meaning cannot be correctly represented by the words, "Revelation teaches us only that God has manifested Himself *relatively to us* as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." He is too exact a thinker to be guilty of such confusion; and he expressly speaks (in p. 131) of the terms, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as "denoting *intrinsic relations* in the Divine Being."

The sixth Proposition,—"There is much of the

language of Platonism in the speculation on the Generation of the Son, and the Procession of the Holy Spirit,"—is falsified by the generalizing of words, which Dr Hampden applies solely to the speculation of Aquinas on the subject. After giving an account of that philosopher's explanation, he adds, "In *this* speculation there is certainly a great deal of the language of Platonism;" and he goes on to prove this. It would be well if those who are so sharpsighted in detecting aberrations from doctrinal truth in another, would be watchful to preserve themselves from far more sinful offenses against moral truth.

The seventh Proposition is taken from the following passage of the Bampton Lectures (p. 137). "The discussions on the Incarnation were in like manner partly physical, partly logical. It was attempted to be explained in what way the Son might be said to be generated of the Father, whether out of the Substance of God, or out of a common Divinity, of which each participates, or by division of the Paternal Substance, as a portion severed from the Father; whether further He is the Son of God by nature, or necessity, or will, or predestination, or adoption. The confusion of principles of different sciences in these promiscuous enquiries is sufficiently apparent. But it was by such a philosophy that the orthodox language was settled, declaring the Son 'begotten before all worlds,' of *one Substance* with the Father." The meaning of this last sentence is plain. According to the author's wont, of tracing the remains of obsolete systems in the current language of theology, he here remarks, innocently enough, that the expression, *of one substance*, has been handed down to us out of the ancient controversies concerning the relation between the Son and the Father. What then can be the heretical meaning, which his accuser designs to impute to him, by citing the proposition, "The orthodox language,

declaring the Son '*begotten* before all worlds, of *one substance* (sic) with the Father,' was settled by a philosophy, wherein the principles of different sciences were confounded?" At least the only thing reprehensible in these words is what the accuser himself foists into them, by printing *begotten* in italics; as though Dr Hampden had asserted that this also was a term derived from a confused philosophical system. One is loth to impute fraud to any one; but our accuser has shewn little claim to a charitable interpretation, either from his own ordinary practice, or from his mode of dealing with his victim.

The fifth Proposition,—"Unitarians, in that they acknowledge the great fundamental facts of the Bible, do not really differ *in religion* from other Christians,"—I have reserved for this place, because it is not connected with the ancient controversies on the Trinity, and because it is extracted from another work, Dr Hampden's *Observations on Religious Dissent;* which was publisht at the time when the question about the admission of Dissenters was much agitated at our Universities. On this question, as also on the more general ones, as to the sinfulness of Dissent, and as to the greater or less comprehensiveness which ought to characterize a Church, various opinions may exist; and each person will of course hold that those who differ from him are mistaken. But it does not follow from this, that those who differ from us are to be branded as heretics, or to have any moral obliquity imputed to them. Dr Hampden's opinions on these points are what are commonly called latitudinarian. But latitudinarianism also may be of divers kinds. One kind, which is utterly worthless, may result from an indifference about religious truth. Another kind may arise from a Christian, Apostolical largeness of spirit, which recognises that all minor differences are of very subordinate, if of any importance,

provided there be agreement upon the central principles of truth. In the interval between these two extremes there is room for many shades of opinion. Now the proposition just cited is not stated distinctly in so many words by Dr Hampden. It is a deduction from the following passage. "In religion, properly so called, few Christians, if any, I speak of course of pious minds, really differ. All acknowledge with nearly unanimous assent, I believe, the great original facts of the Bible. They may not be conscious perhaps, that they do so far agree; and the reason of this is clear; namely, that they judge of their religion from their theological opinions, and reflect back on the one, simple, invariable truth of God, the various lights of some speculative system of doctrines, the mere conclusions of their own reason." Thus far, I conceive, all men of intelligent and candid minds, would agree with Dr Hampden; and the same thing has been said by such persons over and over again. But he then proceeds to argue that the same dogmatical spirit is a principal element and cause of Unitarianism. "I would take the extreme case of the Unitarians; and I would say to them, 'Why do you take so much pains to convince the world that you do not agree with the mass of professing Christians, in believing in the same sense, "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all." Is it not that you identify your religion with your dogmas; that you transfer the natural partiality of your own minds for certain principles, to the broad outlines of Scripture truth, and dissent from your brethren in the faith, because they will not assent to your metaphysical conclusions? For when I look at the reception by the Unitarians, both of the Old and New Testament, I cannot, for my part, strongly as I dislike their theology, deny to those who acknowledge this basis of Divine facts, the name of Christians. Who

indeed is justified in denying the title to any one who professes to love Christ in sincerity?—I do not forget, that passages of Scripture have been retrencht or explained away by Unitarians. But is not this very proceeding an illustration of the mode of interpreting religion by speculative dogmas and conclusions? Not only is the religious fact, but the books themselves, which are the vehicle of it, made to bend and take a colouring from theological opinion. I allude to the case of the Unitarian more particularly, because in the ordinary view he is regarded as more liberal, as less exclusive in his creed, than members of other Christian communions. And I wish it to be considered, whether he is not on the other hand as dogmatic as any other religionist; perhaps the most so of all, so far as he insists, beyond all others, on applying a positive sense to passages and expressions, which Revelation leaves in the darkness of the clouds surrounding the Divine presence. Putting him however on the same footing precisely of earnest religious zeal and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, on which I should place any other Christian, I propose to him impartially to weigh with himself, whether it is not theological dogmatism, and not religious belief, properly so called, which constitutes the principle of his dissent (pp. 19, 20)." In this passage, as in several others treating on the same subject, along with much important truth, there seems to me to be an admixture of error, arising partly from our almost irrepressible propensity to push our favorite conclusions too far, and partly from a somewhat indistinct apprehension of the very truth the author is proclaiming, namely, that the ground and centre of all Christian union is, not agreement in a system of doctrines, but the Person of the Incarnate Son of God, the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind; as the early Church recognised by making the Apostles Creed the

universal Confession of Faith; and as has been so admirably shewn of late in *the Kingdom of Christ.* But, at all events, how different is the impression produced by this passage, taken as a whole, from that of the proposition which the accuser deduces from it, without mention of the strong objections urged against the dogmatical spirit of Unitarianism!

From this Pamphlet seven other extracts are taken, on which I need not spend many words. Indeed two of them (40, 41,) are fragments of the passage just cited, which acquire a more offensive aspect by being severed from the context. In two others, (38, 39,) if they are lookt at with attention, and with a recollection of what has been said, the offensiveness will vanish; even without a reference to the context, which would still more completely disperse it. Another Proposition (22), said to be drawn from these *Observations,* is as follows: "*All opinion, as such, is involuntary in its nature.* It is only a *fallacy* to invest dissent in religion with the awe of the objects about which it is conversant." To aggravate the odium of this passage a note is subjoined, stating that "'Dissent' in Dr Hampden's language includes Unitarianism;" though it is only some pages after, that he speaks of Unitarianism as an extreme case; and it is not very candid to apply a remark, made generally concerning a class of things, to an extreme case. But the extractor's, or rather detractor's, candour will be more manifest, when we see a correct version of his Proposition, and of the context: "For if all opinion, as such, is involuntary in its nature, it is only a fallacy to invest dissent in religion with the awe of the objects about which it is conversant. The awe of the sacred objects indeed imposes a fearful responsibility on every one in forming his own opinions; but it is no reason that others should depart from those principles by which they would judge him in

other subjects. They may guard against his supposed errors with more caution and accuracy on account of their importance; but they must not wield against him the terrors of the invisible world (pp. 5, 6)." What would be the doom of a witness before a court of justice, who gave such garbled evidence? In old times he would have run a risk of the pillory.

The same spirit is indicated in the two remaining extracts from the *Observations*. Dr Hampden publisht a second edition of them in the same year, 1834, in which he corrected certain passages, where he thought his expressions liable to misconstruction. Of this fact the extractor must have been aware, as in two instances (15, 16,) he cites the first edition of the *Observations*. And why does he cite it? Because it contains expressions, by which he thought he might add fuel to the odium against Dr Hampden, though Dr Hampden himself had corrected and withdrawn them. Moreover, such is the disregard for truth with which such matters are now carried on, the author of the Paper laid before us in the Convocation tells us to bear in mind that Dr Hampden has never recalled his opinions, or abandoned his positions. Yet, even in the first edition, if viewed in connexion with the whole context, those passages, fairly interpreted, become innocent. "The real state of the case, (Dr Hampden says,) in regard to our Scriptures is, that the whole Revelation contained in them, so far as it is revelation, consists of matter of fact. Either we have direct and continuous history, acquainting us with the Being, providences, and mercies of God, as the occasions of the world have presented them to our view; or we have predictions of his conduct, as it would appear on certain future occasions; or, as is the case in the didactic and devotional portions, reflexions on the Divine agency in the world, and

application of the instances of His Providences, whether already disclosed, or foretold in prophecy, to the awakening of our love and gratitude and adoration. I venture to say, there are no propositions concerning God in Scripture, detacht from some event of Divine Providence, to which they refer, and on which they are founded. Some perhaps will say, 'An inspired writer has said thus or thus: this then, as asserted by him, is matter of fact: and accordingly it is on matter of fact, in this sense of the expression, that the Christian Revelation is said to be founded.' The expression, *matter of fact*, will no doubt admit this sense. But to interpret the Scripture Revelation in this manner is only to return to the assertion of its dogmatic character, under another form. It brings us back to take the words or propositions written by the inspired writers, as the substance of the Revelation, instead of looking to the authenticated dealings of God in the world. When I say therefore, that the Christian Revelation is matter of fact, I intend by it to express my conviction that the substance of the Revelation is the doings and actions of God: I have always before my view some event in the history of God's providences, to which I refer it. In this sense the truth concerning God is independent of any peculiar wording of it: its proper divine character is exempted from all alloy which the imperfection of the writer, the peculiarity of his circumstances, the idiom of language, may accidentally infuse into it. In this sense texts *as texts* prove nothing: texts establish Divine truths, only as indices to real facts in the history of Divine Providence." Now this paragraph, even as it is thus exprest in the first edition of Dr Hampden's Pamphlet, contains a fund of important truth, so far as it urges that essential characteristic of the Scriptures, whereby they differ so greatly both from the religious books of other religions, and from all the theological systems

founded upon them, that they are not a dogmatical treatise, that they do not set forth the truths which they reveal under the form of abstract propositions, but in their living power, as they are gradually manifested more and more distinctly in the unfolding of God's dealings with mankind; even as the physical world does not utter the law of Gravitation in so many words, and yet does utter it in myriads of ways, by millions of signs and tokens. Nor is it a denial of the law of Gravitation, to say that the physical world does not declare it in the form of a distinct proposition; and in like manner it is no denial of the Scriptural truths, to say that they also are not declared in that form. The general confusion in this respect is the foremost among the innocent causes of the misrepresentations to which Dr Hampden has been subjected. He strongly felt the importance of the truth just explained: he felt no less strongly how the neglect of it has occasioned a number of grievous errours in all ages of the Church, errours as rampant now as ever, especially in the lower classes of Dissent. He felt that, when this truth is lost sight of, and the practice of building up systems of propositions on single words or texts of Scripture is indulged in, all manner of heresies and forms of dissent are sure to spring up. This is the substance of his argument in the passage last cited, and the reason why it is there brought forward. Of course in a Pamphlet, written no doubt hastily, he could not enter fully into this argument, or set it forth with its appropriate limitations: and as some expressions in the latter part of that passage seemed to admit of misconstruction, he left out all but the first two sentences in the second edition. Yet his accuser, being determined to make him an offender for a word, even when that word had been recalled, scrapes up two Propositions (15, 16) out of the sentences which the author had rejected. One is, "We are not to take *the*

words or propositions written by the inspired writers as the *substance* of the revelation, instead of looking to the *authenticated dealings of God in the world:*" which cannot possibly be rightly understood without reference to what had gone before. The other is, "The imperfection of the writers [of Scripture] may accidentally infuse alloy into the character of the truths concerning God." Here the emphasis is greatly magnified by the conversion of an incidental observation into a distinct proposition; while the words, *the imperfection of the writer*, may reasonably be understood to mean that which arose from his position in the gradual unfolding of Revelation; whence the earlier writers had a less full insight into the glory which was to be revealed, than they who lived with and after Him, who was the Incarnate Truth of God, and brought "life and immortality to light."

It may be rejoined indeed,—for there is nothing from which the envenomed ferocity of some of Dr Hampden's enemies will shrink,—that, as in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1838 he said, "I recant nothing that I have written; I disclaim nothing," he may lawfully be charged with whatever can be wrung out even from expressions which he has thrown aside. But of course that declaration merely means, that he is not conscious of having in any respect deviated from the great doctrines of Christianity as set forth by our Church, that, having always held those doctrines with an entire belief, and having endeavoured to make them the principle and rule of his teaching, he is not aware of having ever impugned them, and that the charges brought against him have not convinced him of his having done so. It does not mean, that he had never exprest himself inaccurately or imperfectly in the course of his various disquisitions: for that he had done so, he had amply admitted in his *Inaugural Lecture:*

and a special admission of this is involved in the omission of the questionable sentences, which his accuser has thought fit to pick up and pelt at him.

To return to the Extracts from the Bampton Lectures: the next Proposition fabricated out of them, the eighth in the whole series, is pieced together of scraps of sundry sentences in the last page but one of the last Lecture. "I would once more call attention (Dr Hampden says) to the Divine part of Christianity, as entirely distinct from its episodic additions.—Whatever may have been the speculations of false philosophy on the facts of Christianity, those facts themselves are not toucht.—These facts form part of the great history of mankind: they account for the present condition of things in the world: and we cannot deny them without involving ourselves in universal scepticism. There can be no rational doubt that man is in a degraded, disadvantageous condition, that Jesus Christ came into the world in the mercy of God to produce a restoration of man, that He brought Life and Immortality to light by His coming, that He died on the Cross for our sins, and rose again for our justification, that the Holy Ghost came by His promise to abide with His Church, miraculously assisting the Apostles in the first institution of it, and ever since that period interceding with the hearts of believers. These and other truths connected with them are not collected merely from texts or sentences of Scripture: they are parts of its records. Infinite theories may be raised upon them; but these theories, whether true or false, leave the facts where they were." Out of this passage this proposition is concocted, meant to convict the author of heresy: "The Divine part of Christianity is its facts: the received statements of doctrines are only episodic additions, some out of infinite theories, which may be raised on the texts of Scripture." This is evidently

intended to convey the impression that Dr Hampden regarded the received statements of truth as merely some out of infinite theories which might be raised out of the words of the Bible, and, the reader would of course suppose, as not materially differing in value from the rest: whereas his words, in the sense in which he used them, are simply true and harmless.

The next four Propositions relate to the theory of the Atonement, a subject on which every one at all conversant with the history of theology knows that a number of theories have been constructed. Of these Propositions, the first (9) may be past over, as merely stating a historical fact, that the application of the word *punishment* to the sacrifice of our Saviour is taken from the Aristotelian philosophy; that is to say, as a theoretical term, involving a speculative explanation of the work of Redemption, though supported by analogous expressions in Scripture. Dr Hampden further says: "It is to be remarkt how strongly the inefficacy of repentance to wipe away guilt, and restore the sinner to his lost state, has imprest the minds of those who have thought on human nature with any depth of philosophy. It is of little purpose to urge the natural placability of the Divine Being, His mercy, His willingness to receive the penitent. God, no doubt, is abundantly placable, merciful, and forgiving. Still the fact remains. The offender is guilty: his crime may be forgiven; but his criminality is upon him. The remorse which he feels, the wounds of his conscience, are no fallacious things. He is sensible of them, even whilst the Gospel tells him, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee. Go, and sin no more.' The heart seeks for reparation and satisfaction: its longings are, that its sins may be no more remembered, that the characters in which it is written may be blotted out. Hence the congeniality to its feelings of the notion of Atonement. It

is no speculative thought, which suggests the theory: speculation rather prompts to the rejection of it: speculation furnishes abstract reasons from the Divine attributes for discarding it as a chimera of our fears. But the fact is, that we cannot be at peace without some consciousness of Atonement made. The word Atonement, in its true practical sense, expresses this indisputable fact. Objections may hold against the explanations of the term: they are irrelevant to the thing itself denoted by the term. Turn over the records of human crime; and whether under the forms of superstition, or the enactments of civil government, the fact itself constantly emerges to the view: all concur in shewing that, whilst God is gracious and merciful, repenting Him of the evil, the human heart is inexorable against itself. It may hope, tremblingly hope, that God may forgive it, but it cannot forgive itself. This material and invincible difficulty of the case, the Scripture Revelation has met with a parallel fact. It has said, we have no hope in ourselves, that, looking to ourselves, we cannot expect happiness, and at the same time has fixt our attention on a Holy One who did no sin, whose perfect righteousness it has connected with our unrighteousness, and whose strength it has brought to the evil of our weakness. Thus Christ is emphatically said to be our Atonement, not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done, but that we *may know* that we have past from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him*, and that our *own hearts* may not condemn us. 'If our heart condemn us not,' then may we 'have peace with God:' but, without the thought of Christ, the heart that has any real sense of its condition must sink under its own condemnation."—(Pp. 251—253.)

Who would have imagined that, out of this excellent

passage, two heretical Propositions would be extorted? The first (12) is: "'Atonement' in its true practical sense expresses the fact, that we cannot be at peace without some consciousness of atonement made, not that God may forgive us, but that we may forgive ourselves." Just observe how this sentence is patcht up, and how shamefully it misrepresents the author. Standing thus alone, it is intended to signify that Dr Hampden represents the word *Atonement* as, "in its true practical sense," merely expressing the subjective fact of our consciousness of the need of an Atonement. Whereas, after speaking of this subjective fact, he shews how Revelation has provided the objective fact corresponding to it. And is not this correspondence and harmony between the wants of our nature and the gifts of Revelation one of the strongest evidences of its truth, a proof that it is the true key, from its fitting all the wards of the mysterious lock? The last words in the Proposition are torn out of another sentence, where they stand in a different connexion and meaning: "The heart may hope, tremblingly hope, that God may forgive it; but it cannot forgive itself."

The other Proposition (11) is: "Christ is emphatically *said* to be our Atonement, not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done, but that we *may know* that we have past from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by Him." What is the objectionable matter in these words, it is not easy to see; except that the citer, by printing *said* in italics, seems to insinuate that Dr Hampden meant to question the truth of Christ's really being our Atonement? Yet nothing of the kind is involved in the use of so common a phrase. I have seen it objected indeed somewhere, that it is heretical to deny a change of purpose in God; and that this is inconsistent with our second Article, where Christ is said to have died "to

reconcile His Father to us." But it is plain that these words must be interpreted in conformity to the passages of St Paul from whence they are derived; and it is to be regretted that the framers of our Articles did not more closely follow St Paul's expression, and say, 'to reconcile us to the Father.' For thus St Paul writes: "And all things are of God, Who hath *reconciled us to Himself* by Jesus Christ, and hath given us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ *reconciling the world to Himself*, not imputing their trespasses to them, and hath committed to us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you, in Christ's stead, *Be ye reconciled to God.*" (2 Cor. v. 18—20.) So again (Rom. v. 10), "For if when we were enemies *we were reconciled to God* by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." Again (Eph. ii. 16), "That *He might reconcile both to God*, in one body by the Cross." In like manner (Col. i. 20, 21), "For it pleased the Father, that in Him should all fulness dwell, and, having made peace through the blood of His Cross, by Him to *reconcile all things to Himself;* by Him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven: and you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, *yet now hath He reconciled* in the body of His flesh through death." I know not however whether Dr Hampden meant more by what he has said, than that the reason why Christ is called our Atonement, is not that we may be led thereby to speculate concerning the nature of God, and to ascribe changeableness to Him, but that we may have a full assurance that by his death we are reconciled to God. This explanation is more in accordance with the general spirit of his theology.

The remaining Proposition on this subject (10) is: "The

bane of this *philosophy of expiation* was, that it deprest the power of *man* too low." Now what do these words mean? Standing as they do among a series of Propositions concerning the Atonement, and immediately after one which speaks of the Sacrifice of Christ, the reader is of course intended to infer that "this baneful philosophy of expiation," which thus "deprest the power of man too low," must have related to that Sacrifice. A more perfidious citation was never made: and I understand, as may readily be supposed, that this is the passage which, of all others, has kindled the greatest indignation against its author. Now these words do indeed follow in the original just after the long passage I have quoted about the Atonement. But that passage had been preceded by a discussion on the philosophical speculations concerning punishment, as a compensation for sin, in which the author speaks of the vain notion that "self-mortification would recommend us to the favour of God," and again, "of the fond impiety of supererogation." Returning to this point, he adds: "The bane of this philosophy of expiation was, not that it exalted human agency too highly, but that in reality it deprest the power of man too low. It was no invigoration of the mind, no cheering of the heart to masculine exertion, in working out the great work of salvation, by exaggerated, yet noble, views of what man could accomplish. But it checkt the aspirings, both of the heart and of the intellect, by fixing them at a standard that had only the mockery of Divine strength, and not the reality. It brought men to acquiesce in a confession of impotence, without carrying them at once to the Throne of Grace. The ecclesiastical power stood between the heart and Heaven. Atonement was converted into a theory of Commutation, degrading to the holiness of God, while it spoke the peace of God in terms of flattering delusion to

the sinner. The value of confessions and rites of penance was acknowledged; and, accepting this vain substitute for that assurance of Atonement, which alone can satisfy the longing soul with goodness, men lookt no further. Their proper power was exchanged for a servile dependence on the ministrations of the Priest, the presumed all-sufficiency of a man like themselves." (p. 253.)

The next two Propositions, along with several others, are taken from a discussion in which the author tries to shew how the theological theories of the middle ages were modified by the Realism and the materialist notions of their philosophy. This is a field for ample argument, in which one may differ widely from Dr Hampden. But though his views of that philosophy may be deemed narrow, and not very profound, this can hardly be accounted a disqualification for the Episcopate; since one may fairly doubt whether ten men have sat on the Bench during the last hundred years, who were much profounder philosophers. In examining these Propositions, we must bear in mind that Dr Hampden's expressions mostly refer, not to the Scriptural truths, but to the Scholastic theories concerning them. Thus the Proposition, (30) that "The doctrine of the Sacraments is based upon the mystical philosophy of secret agents in nature, christianized," is merely applied (in p. 314) to the Scholastical, not to the Scriptural doctrine. In like manner the remarks about the connexion between the general belief in magic, and the belief in the magical power of the Sacraments (31) manifestly refer only to the medieval notions concerning them, not to the true doctrine, that Christ operates spiritually through them. Again, where it is said (13), that, in the instance of the woman with the issue of blood, our Lord is described as having perceived that "*virtue* had gone out of Him, — a mode of speaking characteristic of

the prevalent idea concerning the operation of Divine influence, as of something passing from one body to another, —this remark means no more than that the writers of the New Testament used the language of their time with regard to physical facts, without being commissioned to correct that language by the revelation of a sounder natural philosophy. From a like love for etymological speculations, Dr Hampden remarks, in a note on page 324: "We should observe the confusion of ideas prevalent in the early Church on the subject of Baptism. The Church was considered as the *Body of Christ*. The Church also was *the Mother of the Faithful*. Hence being baptized, and being made *a Member of the Body of Christ*, and being *incorporated* into the Church, became equivalent expressions. Hence too the Church was said to *generate* sons by baptism." Again, in a note to page 336, where the author had been speaking of the use of Scholastic terms with reference to the Sacraments, he says: "Hence the enquiries in our baptismal service: 'With what *matter* was this child baptized? With *what words* was this child baptized?'—'because some things, it is said, *essential* to this Sacrament may happen to be omitted through haste.'" Now the first of these notes plainly means merely to point out the confusion of metaphorical terms; the latter, that, even in those simple questions, the words *matter* and *essential* are derived from the Scholastic philosophy. These remarks may not be worth much, and so are only placed in a foot-note. But it is strange to find them adduced as evidence of heresies (34, 35).

Another Proposition (33) on the same subject is, "The assertion of a real and true presence of Christ in the Eucharist resulted from the original *Platonism* of the Church." Here the words "and true" are stuck in by the citer, evidently with the purpose of making Dr Hampden's

statement contradict our doctrine. His words however are: "The questionings of the eleventh century on the nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist evince a doubt as to the point where the evidence of the senses ends, or how far such evidence might be admitted against internal convictions of the mind. Here the original Platonism of the Church ruled the case. A Real Presence was asserted, which implied the deceptiveness of the senses." (P. 72.) That is to say, the doctrine objected to, so far as any objection is conveyed in these words, is the Romish one of Transubstantiation, of which our Articles say that "it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

A somewhat similar perversion occurs, when the historical statement, that "the pantheistic notion of a participation of Deity, or an actual Deification of our nature, is the fundamental idea of the operation of Grace according to the Schoolmen," (p. 197), is turned into the abstract proposition (18), that "a participation of Deity, or an actual Deification of our nature, is the fundamental idea of the *operation* of *Grace* according to the Schoolmen, and is a pantheistic notion." This proposition is followed by a reference to 2 Peter i. 4, θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, of course to insinuate that it contradicts these words of the Apostle. Yet it requires no depth of logic to know, that what is merely stated as an accident of the subject, is not convertible into a predicate. There may be a pantheistic view of the participation of Deity; and the author has tried to shew in some detail that the view of the Schoolmen was such. Still this no way impugns St Peter's declaration, as having a pantheistic character. It is well known how those words of St Paul,—where he says that *in Him we live and move and have our being*,—have been

cited by Pantheists in support of their doctrine. But no one would charge a man who contended against Pantheism, with controverting the grand truth proclaimed by St Paul.

This logical juggling is a familiar practice with our accuser. We have seen several instances of it already. In like manner, Dr Hampden having said (p. 225), that "the idea that prevails throughout the Scholastic discussions on the subject is of a positive deterioration of the carnal nature," his adversary charges him with asserting the proposition (25), that "a positive deterioration of our carnal nature is a Scholastic notion." This coincides with Dr Hampden's statement, in the sense that it was a notion held by the Schoolmen; but then there is nothing heretical in it: whereas in the objectionable sense, which it is intended to bear, that the notion originated with the Schoolmen, it is not warranted by Dr Hampden's words; unless indeed we lay a strong emphasis on the word, *carnal*, as implying a physical, material deterioration of our nature.

So again Dr Hampden, in his account of the Scholastic doctrine of Original Sin, says: "The *universality* of the principle was to be demonstrated. How could it apply, it would be argued, to the case of the infant soul snatcht out of the actual pollutions of the world, as the tender lamb of His flock, taken up by the Shepherd into his own bosom? The theorist, not content with referring to the Redeemer's love, as the simple earnest of the blessedness of the little innocent, sought how to connect this fact with the universal need of Redemption. It was to be brought therefore under the theory of Original Sin. This occasioned the introduction of the term *propagation* into the account of the origin of evil. If the corruption of nature descended by *propagation*, then would it exist even in the guileless infant; and the theory, as thus

stated, would be the logical correspondent to the doctrine of Grace." Out of this statement of the Scholastic theory the accuser manufactures the proposition (26): "The idea that the corruption of nature exists in infants is the result of theory." Again in his second Lecture, Dr Hampden, speaking of the Scholastic Theology, says (p. 80): "Its principles were to be drawn from the nature of the Divine Being, as the only sure ground on which a Divine and Universal Philosophy could fix its first steps. But where was the evidence or criterion of the truth of those principles? Given the nature of the Divine Being, given the principles themselves, immediately as they existed in Him, there could be no doubt of the truth of the conclusions deduced from them. But it was admitted that the nature of God, as He is in Himself, is incomprehensible by the human faculties, that we cannot attain in the present life to the knowledge of His essence. This difficulty might appear insuperable. But it was not so to the Schoolman, verst in an eclectic philosophy, in which the mysticism of Plato was blended with the analytical method of Aristotle. The principle of Faith here answered the purpose of solving this speculative difficulty, as well as of securing the prescriptive right of Authority. Theology then, as a natural knowledge, could not itself discover and establish the principles on which it reasoned. It might however receive those principles through Faith, from a higher science, the science or knowledge of God; as one human science receives its principles from another; as Music, according to the illustration of Aquinas, assumes its principles from Arithmetic, or Perspective from Geometry." To this passage a note is subjoined, giving the words of Aquinas; and from this passage the detractor conjures up the following Proposition (27): "The notion that Faith is a science of the knowledge of God is derived from an eclectic philosophy,

in which the mysticism of Plato was blended with the analytic method of Aristotle." Thus, if one were to say that an Oxford High-Churchman had made use of the most shameless sophistical juggling for the sake of crushing an opponent, a logician of the accuser's school would convert the proposition into an assertion that sophistical juggling is an offspring of the University of Oxford; though the history of controversies shews that such poisonous weeds spring up too readily in all parts of the earth.

Happily I begin to see light, and shall soon be able to relieve both you and myself from this odious investigation, one scarcely less revolting than the worst of those which our Sanitary Commissions have to undertake. Two Propositions (28, 29) are quoted from the discussion about Grace in the fourth Lecture, where the author shews how our language, and our modes of thought, as influenced by our language, on that subject are still affected by the Realism of the Schoolmen; through which Realism expressions, primarily metaphorical, were conceived to denote distinct realities; and Grace, for instance, was regarded, not as the merciful act of a gracious God, but as something existing distinctly in the nature of God, separate from His other Attributes, and infused, as a distinct substance, by Him into the soul of man. Dr Hampden's views on this subject may be controverted, if any one chooses to controvert them, on philosophical grounds; but they have nothing more to do with his orthodoxy, than the question has, whether he believes in the Copernican or the Ptolemaïc System.

The only two remaining passages that seem to call for any notice, relate to the Pelagian controversies; concerning which Dr Hampden says (p. 222), that "Pelagius contended for a moral influence of prevarication of Adam on his posterity; that the first sin was hurtful to the human race, not by *propagation*, but by *example;* not because

they who were propagated from him *drew* from him any vice, any fault; but because all that have afterwards sinned have *imitated* him, the first sinner; and that infants were not in the same state as Adam before transgression, because he was capable of obeying a precept, whilst they had not as yet the exercise of free-will. Celestius, in like manner, rested the corruption of our nature on moral grounds, arguing that sin was not born in us, but was the fault of the Will.—Though the language of the Pelagians did not adequately express the inveteracy of that sinfulness of human nature, which Scripture and the world declare with one voice, we must allow, I think, that their grounds were right, so far as they attempted to give a moral account of the fact, and that their opponents were wrong, so far as they attempted to give a physical or material account of it." From this passage the following Proposition (24) is deduced: "The Pelagians asserted that the first sin was hurtful to the human race, not by *propagation* but by *example:* though their language inadequately expresses the inveteracy of the sinfulness of human nature, *their grounds were right*, so far as they attempted to give a *moral* account of the fact; and *their opponents were wrong*, so far as they attempted to give a *physical* or *material* account of it." This extract is fairer than most of the others, though by its omissions it weakens the author's assertion of our sinfulness. But here again the point in dispute belongs more to the philosophical, than to the religious side of theology. The fact of our sinfulness Dr Hampden fully admits. What he objects to, is the explanation of that fact, of the mode in which sin is transmitted; and in conformity to the principles of his philosophy, he rejects the physical and material explanations of the Realists, and prefers regarding our sinfulness as a primary, inexplicable fact of our moral nature. He goes on to say, that "the

Pelagian theory of human sinfulness sufficiently accounted for the *actual* sins of men. It shewed how our nature might be depraved or improved, that its actual depravation consisted in transgressions like those of the first parent; but it left unexplained the *tendency* to sin existing in human nature, a fact evidenced in the difficulty of resistance to temptation, in the self-denial which right conduct exacts,—'the law warring in the members,' as the Scripture calls it. The following evil example, the assimilating of ourselves to the first transgressor, is only one mode by which this evil tendency finds its way into our conduct, and betrays itself. In itself it is something beyond, and more intimate with our feelings. It had been well, if the orthodox had contented themselves with the name of Original Sin to designate this moral fact, and, whilst they disclaimed the Pelagian theory of Example or Imitation, as inadequate to the solution of the fact, themselves abstained from speculating concerning it. But disputation called upon them to define and pronounce. They thus essayed, what neither Scripture had authorized, nor human reason could reach, to explain the mode of human corruption, to analyse by language the *thing* denoted by the term Original Sin, when the only subject before them was a general fact requiring to be simply and clearly stated." The heretical Proposition (23) drawn from this passage is: "The Orthodox ought to have contented themselves with the *name* of Original Sin, to designate the moral *fact* of the *tendency* (sic) to sin, in human nature." I cannot see that this requires any further answer than is conveyed by the original passage.

Here at length we may pass out of this valley of death. There are still three or four Propositions that I have not noticed; but they seem to be merely stuck in to swell out the list, and, after what has already been said, need no

examination. Such a collection of fraudulent misrepresentations has hardly ever come under my notice, though I have had much sad experience in this way; and it has been a painful task to expose them. But, as I have had to say on a former occasion, a lying spirit is stalking through our Church, and even taking possession of some minds that would otherwise be among its pillars and noblest ornaments: and this spirit we must endeavour to cast out, at whatsoever cost. Who the collecter of this series of Propositions may be, I know not. Most probably he will be found among those whose love of truth has sought a congenial resting-place in the Romish Schism; and his natural end seems to be, unless some higher spirit arrest him, to become a familiar of the Inquisition.

Irksome too as it has been to go on untying one knot of falsehood after another, it seemed requisite that the work should be done thoroughly once for all. My reason for taking the series of charges in the Paper which was laid before us at the meeting of Convocation, I have already stated. It is the only definite, articulate accusation of Dr Hampden that has come in my way. If others have been publisht, they have not reacht me here in the country; nor have I heard of any, except some anonymous letters in newspapers, with which no prudent man will meddle, if he can help it. I am aware indeed, that several pamphlets, some of them by persons of eminent name, were publisht during the contest in 1836. But, as their authors have not brought them forward again, one is loth to rake them up out of the oblivion, which is the fittest sepulcre for such things: and since the republisher of the Propositions, if I have not been misinformed, took an active part in the first controversy, we may assume that a person well acquainted with its details would select the strongest statement out of those which were then produced. Possibly I

may in some instances have done some slight wrong to the original collecter of the Propositions; for, as I have before said, I have only had the second edition of the Bampton Lectures to compare them with. But I have been told, on what seemed to be the best authority, that there is no difference between that and the first. Should the fact be at all otherwise, the chief blame will be due to him who has reprinted the extracts from the first edition without comparing them with the second.

And now, my dear Dean, to what conclusions are we brought? What judgement must we form on Dr Hampden, so far at least as regards the heresies imputed to him, if this is the strongest evidence that can be adduced? Are we not constrained to pronounce the completest, most honorable acquittal? What judgement must we form on the character of his accusers? What weight must we attach to the censures of the Convocation of Oxford? It was doubtless on these very propositions, which we have found to be such gross misrepresentations, or on others of the same kind, that the great bulk of the majority, which voted against him, rested their sentence. Even if the evidence had not been thus garbled and distorted, Dr Hampden's work is one on which nobody is fitted to pass judgement, unless he has been trained to philosophical habits of thought, can exercise speculative discrimination, and has some considerable acquaintance with the history of theology. Yet of how many among his self-constituted judges can we predicate that they possest these indispensable qualifications? Among those too who did possess the intellectual qualifications, how many would not have been challenged on any jury on account of some personal bias? Yet it is on the strength of a decision pronounced by such a tribunal, that the Church is called upon to utter her remonstrances blindly and vociferously from all parts

of the land. About three years ago, some of Dr Hampden's chief assailants were themselves loud in declaring that the Convocation of Oxford is ill qualified to judge on matters of heresy; for then, through the ebb and flow of party-spirit, the tide had turned against them. Yet now the same persons, and thousands taking up their cry, are exclaiming that the Church must put forth all her powers, even in unprecedented modes of action, to arrest the appointment of a Bishop whom the Convocation of Oxford has condemned. The inevitable result of such a struggle must be, that efforts,—which, if made wisely in a righteous cause, with the strength which springs from being in the right, and from a well-grounded conviction of being so, would awaken the sympathy of the whole nation, and be sure of success,—being exercised inconsiderately, and without that sole true strength, must needs fail, and will incur pity from some, contempt and ridicule from others.

In speaking of Dr Hampden's writings, I have confined myself to those which have been selected by his opponents as the grounds of their attacks. Now the latest of these was publisht more than twelve years ago. Surely then, even if there had been more occasion for censure in his early works, we ought to have examined his later ones, with a view of ascertaining whether any traces of the heresies imputed to the earlier are discernible therein: and in them we should find him repeatedly maintaining the very doctrines which he is accused of having denied. You would not have had us protest against Augustin's being made Bishop of Hippo, because in earlier days he had been tainted with Manicheism. Of Dr Hampden personally I know nothing, and ten days ago had never read a word of his writings. An aversion to controversies, when I have no immediate call compelling me to engage

in them, kept me from taking any interest in those which agitated Oxford in 1836; and opinions exprest by some of my friends had led me to imagine that the Bampton Lectures were far less valuable than I have found them to be. Hence I have had no personal motive for undertaking his defense; and, though there is always a satisfaction in attempting to obtain justice for one who has been wronged, this would not have induced me to come forward now, unless other stronger motives made me deem it my duty to do so.

These were, first, that I felt bound to explain, at least to the Clergy of my own Archdeaconry, why I have refused to comply with the invitations which have come to me from several quarters, to join in the proceedings which have been so generally adopted to avert Dr Hampden's appointment. Those over whom one is set to exercise influence, and in brotherly union with whom it is one's heart's desire to fulfill the great work of life, have a right to be informed why one cannot go along with them, nay, desires to repress them, when they are stirred by a strong impulse. But my chief motive has been to do what I can, if I can with God's blessing do anything, to allay the present tumultuous ferment in the Church. The only way of effecting this is to dissipate the delusions whereby it has been kindled. We are called to walk in the light, not in the darkness. We are to walk in the light in all things, in the daylight of the clearest knowledge to which we can attain. We have intellectual gifts entrusted to us; and we are not to let them rust; we are to exercise them diligently, patiently, perseveringly, on all occasions. We are not to take up opinions at random, prejudices at hap-hazard. Where we have not the means of knowing, we are to refrain from speaking. In this noisy, turbulent world, we are especially called to cultivate the holy faculty

of silence. When we have good reason for believing that we know the truth, then let us speak it, openly, upon the housetops, before kings. But when we have no such reason, let us leave the office of speaking to those who are better qualified.

Much zeal has been manifested on this occasion; and zeal in a righteous cause is ever to be honoured. "It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing." But zeal without discretion, zeal under the impulses of ignorance, has dragged martyrs to the stake. Does it not prove to us that the same spirit would be no less violent now, if it were not that the changes in outward circumstances and in public opinion bridled it in,—does it not constrain us to hang down our heads in shame,—when we hear of thousands, as it would seem, of our brethren rushing eagerly to protest, to remonstrate, to sign addresses, against Dr Hampden, while there is scarcely any evidence that a single one among these thousands has thought it his duty to make out carefully and conscientiously how he ought to act, and while it is too plain that hardly any one has studied Dr Hampden's writings with the view of forming his decision? In what other class of men could such a thing happen? Would it happen among lawyers? among physicians? among soldiers or sailors? among merchants? *No!* it will probably be replied: *but then the matters they are concerned in are not of such deep, universal moment, and do not peril our eternal interests.* Yet surely this very consideration ought to make us more careful, more cautious, more scrupulous, ought to teach us that, though in other things we may allow ourselves to act on plausible presumptions, yet, in these matters of awful importance, it behoves us to use all our vigilance, to strain every eye of the mind, lest we deliver an unjust, and therefore an ungodly judgement. Even the town-clerk of

Ephesus would have taught us more orderly and decorous conduct, that we ought to be quiet, and do nothing rashly, but proceed regularly before a lawful court. Whereas our agitation, which is only the more tumultuous from the want of any reasonable grounds for it, has involved us in something like a November London fog, where there is no one, except the noisy linkboys of the religious newspapers, to shew us the way. Darkness is the element of fanaticism; and they who walk in darkness are sure to stumble. It is only in the light that we can walk straightforward, calmly and steadily; and so, and so alone, can "we have fellowship one with another."

May we, my dear Dean, endeavour so to walk in all things! and may it ever be our prayer to the Father, that He will cast His bright beams of light, and pour down the Spirit of right judgement, abundantly on ourselves and on the whole Church!

Yours very sincerely,

J. C. HARE.

Herstmonceux, December 11th, 1847.

Since this letter was written, I have read the Remonstrance addrest to Lord John Russell by thirteen of our Bishops, and his answer to them: and though the result has only verified the opinions I have been expressing, it has filled me with deep regret. It has been a great grief to me to see such a body of the Fathers of our Church, among whom are several persons held in honour by our whole Church, and for several of whom I have reason personally to feel high regard and respect, placed in a situation in which, it seems to me, they could not but fail of accomplishing their object. Their sacred office and character

would doubtless have ensured their success, if they could have adduced adequate reasons for their remonstrance: but the most painful part of the affair is, that the general sense of justice will go along with the Minister in his refusal to attend to it. For, though a private remonstrance, previous to the appointment, urging that it would be repugnant to the general feeling of the Clergy, and would tend grievously to disturb the peace of the Church, would, and ought to have had very great weight, yet, when the appointment had once been determined upon, and that determination had become so notorious, it would have been derogatory to the Crown to have retracted its nomination on any less ground than that its nominee had been pronounced guilty of heresy by the sentence of a regular ecclesiastical tribunal. Nor could the Crown accept the decree of the Convocation of Oxford in lieu of such a sentence; more especially when the Bishops themselves, as Lord John Russell reminds them, refrain from expressing any judgement on the point. The popular ferment might have been a reason for hesitating beforehand, but could not be so now, unless it were shewn to be reasonable. An unreasoning excitement is to be allayed, not by giving up its victim to it, but by calm consistency and cogent argument.

Besides, I feel bound here to retract the condemnation exprest in my letter on the conduct of the Minister in making the appointment. Still indeed I deplore that appointment, on account of the offense which it was sure to give to so many, and of the consequences which we, knowing the feelings of the Clergy, could foresee must inevitably ensue. But the Minister, who cannot possibly be in like manner acquainted with those feelings, and who had the presumption supplied by Dr Hampden's having discharged his professorial office for so many years without any complaint against his doctrine, took all the precautions

which became a person in his position, by communicating his intention so long before to our Primate. Having done this, it seems to me, he is bound to maintain his appointment, unless some judicial reasons for withdrawing it are placed before him. After this proof that the present agitation must be utterly ineffectual, that it can produce nothing but distraction, contention, and other evils, I trust it will soon abate. In trying to quiet it, I will most gladly join with you heart and hand. This strengthens my conviction of the necessity of proving to the Church, that the act of the Minister is not an arbitrary exercise of the power with which he is invested, that he is not tyranically imposing a heretical Bishop on our Church, and that the person whom he has nominated does not deserve the charges brought against him, but may boldly plead, and has pleaded, that he is entirely innocent. Surely it is not too much to hope that many of our brethren, when they see this detailed, explicit refutation of the accusations against Dr Hampden, will at least be led to examine his works, and may perhaps be aided by the foregoing remarks in perceiving that the Extracts, on which they have grounded their opinions, have grossly wronged him; and when this point has been gained, the sense of justice must needs do the rest. Let Righteousness and Truth meet together, Mercy and Peace will ever come in their train.

December 14th, 1847.

London: Printed by S. Bentley & Co. Bangor House, Shoe Lane.